REMARKS

Claims 49-74 are pending, of which Claims 49, 59 and 71 are independent. Claims 49 and 71 are amended by the present amendment. All claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and/or 103(a). For the reasons discussed below, these rejections are respectfully traversed. With entry of the present amendment, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 71 has been rejected based on 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the geographically bounded website content." In response, this limitation has been amended by the present amendment to refer to "the geographically bounded webpages," which was introduced in the preceding limitation regarding spidering webpages. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 49-74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmelstein et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0011270) in view of Petereson et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,682), further in view of Labio et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,089,301). Reconsideration of the § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

For explanation, but without limitation to the claims, certain embodiments will be described. The present system relates to an approach to identifying peer computers associated with a geographically bonded region in order to create an offline geographically bounded subset of the Internet, which is stored and indexed on a tablet device. In particular, peer computers associated with a geographically bounded region are identified and assigned geographically bounded URLs for spidering. The peer computers spider and index the geographically bounded URLs, and collectively the peer computers, in order to create a geographically bounded subset of the Internet, which is stored on a tablet device. Having peer computers associated with a geographically bounded region crawl the geographically bounded URLs to create a group index

leads to fresher indexing. In addition, by assigning geographically bounded URLs for spidering and indexing to a plurality of peer computers, the present approach can reduce the processing power required for each computer individually to create the offline geographically bounded subset of the Internet.

Thus, by storing geographically bounded websites on a tablet device and making the indexed website content available offline, a user has the ability to use the tablet device to access this geographically based subset of the Internet, without connecting to the Internet. Moreover, by distributing the processing tasks among a plurality of peer computers, the present system can optimize implementation of this resulting geographically based subset of the Internet by providing improved content freshness and reducing computational resources and bandwidth required for each peer computer during implementation.

By way of contrast, Himmelstein is directed to an approach to using indexing/crawling to geocode webpages. Himmelstein extracts geographical information in the text of the webpages during the crawling process to tie the webpage to a particular geographical location.

Himmelstein was cited by the Office to show the claimed features of *identifying a plurality of peer computers associated with the geographically bounded region, the peer computers to perform distributed processing tasks to enable creation of a geographically bounded searchable index of webpages.* It is respectfully submitted, however, that Himmelstein does not discuss this inventive feature. In particular, Himmelstein does not contemplate the resource problems involved in creating a geographically based subset of the Internet. In fact, Himmelstein is directed to an approach to associating webpages with a particular geographic region. Himmelstein does not aim to create a geographically based subset of the Internet available for offline retrieval from tablet devices. As such, Himmelstein does not address the resource problems (e.g. bandwidth and processing power requirements) involved in creating a geographically based subset of the Internet available for offline retrieval from tablet devices. Moreover, Himmelstein does not address the content freshness issues associated with creating a geographically based subset of the Internet available for offline retrieval from tablet devices. As

such, it is respectfully submitted that Himmelstein is not directed to an approach to implementing a geographically based subset of the Internet for offline retrieval that has improved content freshness.

The Office correctly notes that Himmelstein does not discuss the distributed processing technique using peer computers, and Labio was cited to show this feature.

Labio, however, is directed to an approach to directing a search of peer computers in the peer-to-peer network. Labio does not discuss anything about web-based indexing, spidering, or crawling. In fact, Labio does not even contemplate reducing processing power and bandwith per computer and improving content freshness by using a distributed processing scheme with peer computers to create a geographically based subset of the Internet available for offline retrieval from tablet devices.

Because Labio does not relate to web-based indexing, spidering, or crawling, Labio is non-analogous art. As such, any rejection based on Labio should be withdrawn.

The present system identifies peer computers that have an interest in participating in the creation (spidering/crawling and indexing) of a geographically based subset of the Internet available for offline retrieval from tablet devices. In particular, the invention specifies *identifying a plurality of peer computers associated with the geographically bounded region, the peer computers to perform distributed processing tasks to enable creation of a geographically bounded searchable index of webpages*, as set forth in Claim 1. By identifying peer computers to participate and share responsibilities in the creation of this geographically bounded subset of the Internet, the invention implements a self sustaining architecture to assure content freshness and thereby address issues of staleness that would have normally plagued an offline subset of the internet. None of the cited references contemplate such an architecture to create a geographically bounded subset of the internet for offline retrieval.

Further, the Office correctly notes that Himmelstein does not discuss a geographically bounded subset of the internet for offline retrieval, and Peterson is cited to show this inventive feature.

Peterson, however, is directed to an approach for scheduling delivery of web content to a client system and enabling offline access to the web content. In Peterson's scheduling system, the client has a delivery subsystem that schedules delivery to the client of web content based on the user preferences of the client (e.g. Microsoft Channels, News, Sports, Business, Entertainment, Lifestyle and Travel, etc.).

Peterson does not even contemplate the problems associated with resource needs (e.g. processing power and bandwidth requirements) imposed on a client when creating an offline subset of the Internet. Further, Peterson does not address the problems involved in creating a viable offline subset of the internet that does not suffer from stale content.

The present invention provides an approach to creating a geographically bounded offline subset of the Internet that has improved content freshness and reduces the processing and bandwidth needed for each peer computer participating in its implementation. Peterson, Himmelstein, and Labio, taken alone or in combination, neither address the issue of staleness nor do they address the resource problems (e.g. bandwidth, processing power, etc.) associated with creating a geographically bounded subset of the internet for offline retrieval from a tablet. As such, these references, taken alone or in combination, do not discuss:

- creating and maintaining a list of attribute bounded electronic addresses representing a plurality of indexable electronic documents, on a computer network, that are associated with a geographically bounded region, where the computer network is the Internet and the electronic documents are webpages on the Internet;
- identifying a plurality of peer computers associated with the geographically bounded region, the peer computers to perform distributed processing tasks to enable creation of a geographically bounded searchable index of webpages, where the

geographically bounded searchable index of webpages is created by the peer computers spidering the geographically bounded webpages;

- in response to receiving a geographically bounded request from one of the computers, assigning one or more geographically bounded electronic addresses from the geographically bounded list, where the requesting computer processes the assigned geographically bounded electronic address to index one or more geographically bounded webpages that are obtained through the assigned geographically bounded electronic address;
- storing the geographically bounded searchable index of webpages locally on a local hard drive of a tablet device, where the geographically bounded searchable index of webpages is accessible offline from the local hard drive of the tablet device without accessing the Internet; and
- enabling, from the tablet device, access to one or more of the geographically bounded webpages without connecting to the Internet, as set forth in Claim 1.

Independent Claims 59 and 71 recite limitations similar to Claim 1. For reasons similar to those set forth above, neither base Claims 59 and 71, are discussed in Peterson, Himmelstein, and Labio, taken alone or in combination.

In addition, base Claim 71 specifies *creating a virtual community within a peer-to-peer computer network by identifying peer computer connections based upon a geographically bounded region*, and none of the cited references discuss this inventive concept. In particular, none of the cited references discuss creating a geographically bounded subset of the internet, which is maintained by a virtual community of geographically bounded computers.

As such, it is respectfully requested that the § 103(a) rejection of Claims 49-74 based on Peterson, Himmelstein, and Labio be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By /Giovanna H. Fessenden, Reg. No. 60264/
Giovanna H. Fessenden
Registration No. 60,264
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Date: 9/14/09